A

SPEECH

ON THE

REPEAL

OF SUCH PARTS OF THE

Teſt and Corporation Acts

AS AFFECT

CONSCIENTIOUS DISSENTERS:

INTENDED

To have been delivered before the General Body of Diſſenting Miniſters at the Library in Red Croſs Street, December 22, 1789.

By JOHN MARTIN.

ALL MEMBERS HAVE NOT THE SAME OFFICE.
Rom. xii. 4.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

1790.

[Price Sixpence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

A SPEECH, &c.

MR. CHAIRMAN,*

YOU will ſoon be convinced, I am not induced to ſpeak in hope of applauſe. Could I ſuppoſe my opinion will be approved, it would give me pleaſure; but I am too well acquainted with the ſentiments of this ſociety to flatter myſelf with ſucceſs. I have, however, taken ſome pains to underſtand the object of this meeting; and therefore, am not alarmed at the proſpect of oppoſition.

We are now met, it ſeems, "To conſider of the meaſures proper to be adopted to ex-

 preſs

* The Rev. Mr. PALMER, of Hackney, was in the Chair.

preſs our concurrence with our brethren in the country in their reſolutions, occaſioned by their application to Parliament, for the repeal of the Corporation and Teſt Acts."

I find, Sir, they have reſolved, " That it is their duty to petition the Legiſlature in a body for redreſs of their grievances, and to continue their applications until their civil rights be reſtored, and until all penal ſtatutes in matters of religion be repealed."

From this reſolution it appears, our brethren have two things in view; " civil rights and matters of religion." The queſtion therefore, is, Whether articles ſo diſtinct ſhould be united; or whether the laſt clauſe of this reſolution is not that alone which *we* ſhould endeavour to ſupport?

I wiſh to prove, (not in form, but with that freedom of ſpeech which ſuch debates admit) that we ſhould concur only with the latter of theſe two articles; and that the former is not likely to be of any ſervice to religion.

If

If by " a repeal of all penal ſtatutes in matters of religion," every man, who is conſcientious in his diſſent from the Church of England, may reap the advantage, no perſon more cordially wiſhes for ſuch a repeal than myſelf. In ſoliciting *ſuch* relief we ſhould act in character; and, I believe, we ſhould be heard with liberal attention. But if we are officious, if not content with the repeal of thoſe ſtatutes which affect the conſciences of mankind, we ruſh into the endleſs conteſt for civil rights, I am afraid we ſhall wake that jealouſy which ſeldom ſlumbers, and rouſe that temper it cannot be our credit to provoke.

Civil government, I allow, is not inconſiſtent with the pureſt ſchemes of chriſtianity. " Public offices and truſts, when *offered* by thoſe in power, ought not to be refuſed by ſuch as think themſelves capable of rightly diſcharging them; becauſe this would be to reject an opportunity of *public ſervice* to which their country calls them. But this

may be done without a *ſolicitude* to procure them." †

We, as miniſters, are already exempted from offices of *burden:* nor can we wiſh to be employed in civil buſineſs? We do not covet, I preſume, to "have any concern in the direction of the Bank of England, the Eaſt India, Ruſſia, or South Sea Companies." We cannot deſire to be Tide-waiters, or Exciſe-men; nor do we, I hope, aſpire to be Juſtices of the Peace.

If our brethren, who are not in the miniſtry, have ſet their affections on theſe things, and are perſuaded they have a right to enjoy ſuch diſtinctions, are they not competent to urge their own claim? It ſeems as ſtrange they ſhould invite us to interfere, as it is affecting to behold with what eagerneſs the invitation is accepted.

Can we ſuppoſe the King, the Houſe of Lords, or Commons, will liſten more attentively

† Towgood.

tively to a petition in which a path to civil honour and ſecular dominion is requeſted, becauſe it meets with our approbation? What CHARLES the SECOND unfaithfully promiſed, at BREDA, namely, "A liberty to tender conſciences, and that no man ſhall be diſquieted, or called in queſtion for differences in opinion, in matters of religion, which do not diſturb the peace of this kingdom," we may aſk with honour. If we advance beyond an unequivocal explanation of the laſt clauſe, our road will be perplexing, and our efforts will be uſeleſs.

Civil right is a ſubject of delicate and of deep diſcuſſion. It is not only a right which bad men may poſſeſs, but a right which they who have nothing greater in view, are more anxious to ſeize than men who "lay hold on eternal life." It is ſaid, our brethren have a natural right to places of truſt in every department of civil government. What they *have* they need not *ſeek*. Nor are they, I believe, ſo inconſiſtent. They are conſcious

their natural right is both *naked* and *diſtant* from actual poſſeſſion; they wiſh, therefore, to have it *clothed* and *introduced* to public notice. In other words, they wiſh to procure ſuch a *declaration* of their right as they have not yet acquired. To this end, they ſend up petitions to Parliament. Are the conſequences of ſuch ſubmiſſion impartially conſidered? Perhaps not: For it implies, they have ſubmitted their caſe to proper judges, who have a right to vote upon it to the beſt of their own underſtandings. How far this will be admitted, I cannot ſay: but it will anſwer no purpoſe to call in queſtion the right of Legiſlators to judge for themſelves; ſince we conſider this privilege as ſacred, and as ſettled beyond diſpute. If our Senators have not this right, how have we obtained it? If they are deprived of this advantage, to what end are they aſſembled; or why are they affronted with renewed appeals? Can they be *Parliament*-men who are not allowed to *ſpeak* their *own minds?*

Though

Though I plead for the right of private judgment, and for every man being heard till he is properly called to order, yet I have not the higheſt expectation from freedom of thought and ſpeech. Reſtraint, however, would be unjuſt where indulgence may be of no ſervice. The word *underſtanding*, when applied to individuals, or to collective bodies of men, is equivocal. We, by following the dictates of our own underſtanding, are Diſſenters. Our ſuperiors, in the State, on the ſame general principle, are members of the Church of England. According to Mr. Towgood, that Church hath ſet forth "A new Edition of Christianity, with corrections and amendments:" but, in the opinion of her advocates, ſhe keeps herſelf at due diſtance from ſurrounding extremes. Mr. Towgood ſays, "We are content with the old primitive plan of doctrines and rites, which Christ and his *Apoſtles* eſtabliſhed in the Church." Others apprehend, that rites which are indefenſible, and doctrines which are pernicious, may be ſeen and heard in

ſome

ſome of our aſſemblies. It cannot be denied, that, on religious ſubjects, we are greatly divided; and, it is plain, on civil government, we are far from being harmonious. Some of our congregations applaud thoſe political harangues which others would not endure; and what ſome of our churches endure, it is probable, other non-conformiſts would not ſo much as permit.

It is no ſecret that Church-men are as divided as ourſelves. From opinions ſo various, from diſputes which have prevailed in all ages, and which yet prevail in every country, we may infer, that human underſtanding is no where in a ſtate of perfection. It is ſo ſtained with prejudice, ſo diſtorted by partiality, and ſo corrupted by venal purſuits, that reaſon and ſophiſtry, argument and paſſion, are frequently confounded. When therefore, the love of unbounded authority in Princes, and a rage for independency in the people, are violent, the world, like the ocean in a ſtorm, puts on a terrible appearance. In ſuch commotions, the notion of a

living

living infallible judge, will yield us no relief: but, in all our perplexities we may derive advantage from piety, patience and prudence: For they will induce us to adopt thoſe manners that excite good will, and to be content with thoſe arguments which operate by conviction. This is always profitable; and ſometimes productive of permanent alterations: and though this mode of obtaining relief is not pleaſing to the impatient, it is eſſential to a real cure of their complaints. Let us not be deceived; that is a not a remedy which introduces greater evils than it removes.

In a ſpeech which has been highly applauded, there are ſtrokes which hurt my feelings. We are repeatedly told, "That the pretented *toleration* of Diſſenters is a real *perſecution.*" Such language is as impolitic as it is unjuſt. Toleration and perſecution may exiſt at the ſame time; but can they be conſidered as the ſame thing? All legal perſecutions, in this country, have been the offſpring either of *Statute* law or of *Canon* law;

law; nevertheleſs, that Act which repeals the oppreſſive power of preceding Acts, and prevents the waſps and hornets in low life from darting out their ſtings, ſhould ever be mentioned with becoming temper.

Toleration was granted us in the firſt ſeſſion of WILLIAM the THIRD. Had that PRINCE the remoteſt intention to perſecute Proteſtant Diſſenters? Our ableſt lawyers have ſaid, by that ſtatute our worſhip is eſtabliſhed, and our congregations legally protected. Is this perſecution? Since that period, ſeveral Acts have paſſed in our favour; and, from the diſpoſition of the King and Parliament, there is reaſon to conclude every thing that is eligible will be admitted without regret.

I cannot look on the portraits ‖ before me, and forget the gratitude of many eminent men for the Act of Toleration. Gratitude, however, in hearts like ours, is too apt to decay. On this ſubject, by the cauſe of ALLEN EVANS, *Eſq.* it was remarkably revived.

‖ Portraits of Diſſenting Miniſters.

revived.—Well it might; for "this was a cauſe of great expectation—intereſting to the Diſſenters, not only in London, but in every Corporation in the Kingdom." The plea of EVANS is well known; and, I hope, the ſpeeches of LORD MANSFIELD, LORD WILMOT, and of MR. JUSTICE FORSTER, in that cauſe, will never be forgotten.

"Every ſpecies of poſitive penalty, for different modes of faith and worſhip, is at once anti-chriſtian and impolitic, irrational and unjuſt." ‡ To requeſt the repeal of ſuch penal ſtatutes, becomes our profeſſion; to connect this with buſineſs not belonging to us, is eaſy; but to reflect on ſuch imprudence may be painful.

Liberty and right are terms difficult to be defined. The boundaries of thoſe bleſſings, like the boundaries of a pariſh, have frequently occaſioned warm diſputes. They who contend for civil rights are in danger of running to exceſs; and, as their antagoniſts

‡ TOPLADY.

niſts are as earneſt to ſecure ſuch poſſeſſions, as they who contend with them to claim a ſhare, the final conſequence of ſuch quarrels ſeldom exhibits a pleaſing picture of the human mind.

A *natural* right to *civil* poſſeſſions may be diſputed. All bodies of people who have long had the management of buſineſs, civil or military, have ſome laws which they will not alter; and certain rules and cuſtoms which they are reluctant to repeal. If I wiſhed to be made free of the city of London, as I have no right to this privilege by birth, nor by ſervice, I muſt obtain it by purchaſe, or by favour. In every mode of acquiſition, the freedom of this city is ſubject to its own laws; or to a vote of the Corporation. A gentleman * near me is a citizen by *favour*; and the manner in which he accepted that compliment, clearly ſhews he had not a previous right to that honour.

Not in corporate ſocieties only, but in thoſe which have no claim to ſuch diſtinction, rules and cuſtoms are regarded. We meet

* Dr. Price.

meet as Proteſtant Diſſenters of the § three denominations; yet each of theſe denominations have miniſters who are not of this body If thoſe miniſters, whether in town, or from the country, wiſh to hear our debates, how are they to gain admittance? They muſt ſend in their names to the CHAIR, and enter on the idea of indulgence; for it is held they have no *right* to be preſent. I do not complain of this order; but the manner in which we regard it, involves thoſe conſequences which ſome who hear me will underſtand—and diſapprove.

Beſides our ſettled rules, we have our *leading*-men. When thoſe who *lead* and thoſe who are *led* have any particular object in view, buſineſs is ſoon diſpatched. Propoſitions are previouſly prepared; they are introduced with a ſuitable addreſs; they are ſeconded with confidence of being carried; diſcuſſion is deemed improper; they muſt be read as the buſineſs of the day; ſuch alterations

§ Preſbyterians, Independents and Baptiſts.

alterations only are allowed as do not affect the original plan; the propoſitions are then paſſed, and the buſineſs is done.

I am not diſpoſed to murmur at *leading*-men, either in the Houſe of Commons, or in Red Croſs Street. Such men enter into every circle in life; and are, perhaps, eſſential to ſocial happineſs. It is not the character, but the abuſe of that character, which I lament. This evil has exiſted in every age; it has, however, been diminiſhed by juſt remonſtrance, and by decent oppoſition; and it is poſſible, this ſpeech may not be without effect.

Lately, we had a Secretary who reſigned his office. On his reſignation, was every member of this ſociety *equally* eligible to that place? We have not, I own, a law which renders any of our *members* ineligible; but have we not that kind of influence which operates, if I may ſo expreſs it, as a living law? But, Sir, if I aſk, Whether any perſon who is *not* a member of this body

body was eligible to that office; the anſwer is obvious; and, you might probably contend for the propriety of that reſtriction. If then, our Secretary had twelve thouſand pounds a year, or twelve hundred pounds a year, (who in fact has no ſtipend at all) would his office be more open and unconfined?

I may be told, there is a great diſparity between all the objects I have mentioned and the Parliament of Great Britain: ſo there is between a drop of water and the ocean; between a mole-hill and "the great globe itſelf;" yet they are ſubject to the ſame laws. If Corporations and other ſocieties ſo much inferior to that National Aſſembly in which every member is a Legiſlator, will not repeal any of their rules and cuſtoms without conviction, can we ſuppoſe Acts of Parliament will be repealed on any lower principle? To ſay, that Senators *ought* to ſee the propriety of our requeſt, is to aſſert, They ought to be governed by *our*

judgment, and not by their *own*. To contend they *are* convinced of the equity of a requeit they have repeatedly rejected, is to interfere with the right of conſcience, and to expoſe our own conſciences to ſimilar aſſaults.

The Houſe of Commons, honourable as it now is, waited long before it was *acknowledged* to be a *neceſſary* branch of the Britiſh Government. He who conſults our beſt Hiſtorians, or the Statutes at Large, knows that the plenitude of its power is not of antient date. To this day, the right of voting for Members to ſit in Parliament, is difficult to be explained. A man who has a *freehold* of forty ſhillings a year, has a legal vote; while men of much greater property, held by a different *tenure*, are deprived of that privilege. At ABINGDON, though it is very remarkable, I am told, one Member is choſen by the inhabitants at large not receiving alms. At LONDON, they who vote on the ſame occaſion,

ſion, muſt produce different credentials. Reaſon would correct theſe abuſes; but what is ſo called is not always to be truſted. Our reaſon, imperfect as it is, when employed on *unchangeable* quantities, may perform wonders; but when ſhe makes the *fickle* diſpoſitions of men her ſubject, ſhe often labours to little purpoſe.

We have been frequently told, our brethren are every way qualified for thoſe ſtations in which they wiſh to move. If this be true, (and doubtleſs they are ſome of them as well qualified as their neighbours) in proportion to the fact, ſo is the argument of their being competent to plead their own cauſe. It is to the credit of this country, that many more are fit to bear rule than can be employed; but is it evident that men of that character are *moſt* anxious to poſſeſs dominion? I wiſh, Sir, with all my heart, *we*, at leaſt, may not be "buſy bodies in other men's matters." To avoid that odious imputation, let us conſider, whether the aſſo-

ciations which have been formed are either conſiſtent, prudent or expedient.

Is it conſiſtent to unite ſubjects ſo diſtinct as "civil rights and matters of religion" in the ſame requeſt? Is it conſiſtent to talk in ſuch ſtrong terms of *right*, and, at the ſame time, to adopt the language of *ſupplication?* Is it prudent to riſk the loſing a real advantage to religion, by the indulgence of intemperate deſires for civil poſſeſſions? If it be expedient our brethren ſhould poſſeſs thoſe places to which they aſpire, it muſt be expedient for the *State*, for the *Church of England*, or for us as *Diſſenters*. Whether this is expedient for the *State*, we cannot be conſidered as the beſt judges: Here we may fairly be excuſed. If this is expedient for the *Church*, ſhe is able to perceive it, and to plead her own cauſe: Here it becomes us to be ſilent. If this is expedient for us as *Diſſenters*, here, indeed, we may be allowed to judge. But here difficulties occur not eaſy to be ſurmounted.—The evidence I beg leave to produce and read, will perhaps be found invincible.

THE HONOURABLE MR. BEAUFOY:

" If any hazard can attend the abolition of the Sacramental Laws, it is on the *Diſſenters themſelves*, and not on the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, that the danger will be brought. To *her* the repeal is increaſe of attachment, acceſſion of good will, and confirmation of ſecurity.—To *them* it is weakneſs of union, abatement of zeal, and diminution of ardour. As *men* who value their rights, as *citizens* indignant of oppreſſion, their benefit from the repeal will indeed be great; but as *Diſſenters*, as perſons who form a ſeparate claſs, and conſtitute a diſtinct intereſt in the community, the repeal is an irreparable loſs; for the decline of their power will ſoon follow the cloſe of the *perſecution* to which it owes compactneſs, energy, and ſtrength.—How viſionary then, how perfectly ideal, are all apprehenſions of the effect of this meaſure on the intereſts of the Eſtabliſhed Church!"

DR.

DR. FURNEAUX:

" It is my firm opinion, that the repeal of the Teſt would be a greater diſadvantage to the body of Diſſenters, than to the Eſtabliſhed Church; that it would rather diminiſh than increaſe their numbers. For, in general, men are not much inclined to ſhock all the principles on which they have acted, and deſert a party with which they are connected, at *once*, on a lucrative motive; but they may be *gradually* ſoftened and relaxed in their principles, by the new connections into which the poſſeſſion of public offices would introduce them, by the influence of general cuſtom, and of what is eſteemed polite and faſhionable, and by the example of their ſuperiors, or of the majority; provided they are not diſguſted and revolted by any ungenerous compulſion or reſtraint.

MR. TOWGOOD TO MR. WHITE:

" As much therefore, as you are concerned for the honour of *the Church*, and for the

the intereſt, reputation, and comfort of its *Clergy*, ſo much you ought to wiſh and zealouſly promote the repeal of *this law* †. A law, which, whatever was its original intention, hath in its application let in like a *flood gate* upon your Church, the dregs of the human race. A law, which, though at firſt deſigned only the more effectually to prevent all danger to the Conſtitution from *Papiſts*, hath by an unnatural perverſion of it, actually broken down all *diſtinctions*, eſtabliſhed by divine authority, betwixt *ſacred* and *prophane:* has thruſt infidels and profligates into the *moſt holy places* of your Temple, and brings deiſts and debauchees to eat at the Lord's table amongſt the children of his houſe.—As to myſelf, Sir, I aſſure you, though I think *this law* to be a moſt unrighteous reſtraint upon us, and an undoubted violation of our natural rights; yet I am *far* from being perſuaded that its repeal would be of the *leaſt* ſervice to our intereſt as *Diſſenters*. I doubt, and have often thought, that there is too much truth in what

† The Teſt Law.

what you ſay—*That high truſts, public offices, and court employments, would be extremely apt to corrupt us, and to make practical religion more viſibly decay*—and that it would *really* rather injure than ſtrengthen our intereſt. I have never therefore, as a *Diſſenter*, been at all ſolicitous for the *repeal*."

Mr. Towgood does not imagine there is "an abſolute incapacity of being virtuous in high ſtations;" but, he juſtly obſerves, "If there be a *great* danger of being *vicious*, this will juſtify ſurely an *indifference*, a *non-ſolicitude* about them; and will excuſe, at leaſt, a *doubt*, a *fear*, as to the event.

From the ingenious Author of the Comment on Bp. Warburton's Alliance, Mr. Towgood has the following quotation: "An *indifferency* to the honours, riches, and pleaſures of this world, a contempt of and victory over them, is the *independency* and *ſupremacy* which the true religion and Church can boaſt; the reſignation (or loſs) of which muſt be infinitely dangerous to her; her poiſon, her death wound.—Though

it

it may be thought I am pleading for the introduction of Proteſtant *Diſſenters* into places of profit and truſt, I am fully perſuaded that their having ſuch places would not make them more religious men, nor from numbers of them ſo employed would their ſocieties appear with greater reputation as religious ſocieties." This is the language of a Churchman; and it is worthy our notice. But, alas! how few in the Church of England, or out of it, aſpire to ſuch dignity, or thirſt for ſuch dominion.

When I conſider the effect of theſe arguments on ſome of the beſt and wiſeſt of my acquaintance, and conſult my own feelings on the evidence which has been read, I think we may ſay to ſome petitioners, "Ye know not what ye aſk."

I am, Sir, a conſcientious Diſſenter from the Church of England; but, at the ſame time, a peaceable ſubject of the State. I believe, that religion is a perſonal concern. The notion of our being "true members

of the Church of England *de jure*, tho' we are not, and will not be *de facto*," is a refinement, indeed, and quite ſurpaſſes my comprehenſion. I think it enters eſſentially into the idea of *a Church*, that it is *a ſociety of* VOLUNTEERS: A company joined together in certain acts and profeſſions by *common* CONSENT: And that *without*, much leſs *againſt*, his own agreement and conſent, no man could, with truth, be ſtiled a member of any *Church* ‡. On this principle, I cannot think I ſhall ever prefer chriſtian communion in a *national* Church. The King and Parliament, undoubtedly, have a right to form their own creed, to chooſe their own preachers, to call them by what names they pleaſe, and to make ſuch proviſion for their ſupport as they think proper: provided they act conſtitutionally. I behold a *rochet*, a *mitre* and *lawn ſleeves* without envy; and without a wiſh to be inveſted with ſuch diſtinctions. The ſeparation between us and the HIERARCHY of this country, has been of ſervice to both; were we to unite, the coalition would by no means agree with the ſimplicity of the goſpel.

" A

‡ Mr. TOWGOOD.

" A Proteſtant Diſſenting Clergy, as they have no proviſion made for them by *public Authority*, are obliged to be circumſpect in their conduct, as well as ſedulous in their ſtudies; and innumerable inſtances may be given, where this has had a check upon the Eſtabliſhed Clergy: this ſort of emulation muſt be attended with advantage to the Church, and greatly preſerve its credit and reputation. Nay, it is matter of doubt with me, whether the face of proteſtant liberty will remain among us any longer than the intereſt of a Proteſtant Diſſent from a public Eſtabliſhment is ſupported §."

If, Sir, as this gentleman aſſerts, we have called forth an emulation ſo much to the advantage of our brethren in the Church, and ſo beneficial to the public at large, let us cheerfully own, that the learning, good ſenſe, and piety of many Clergymen, have been of great utility to us. My ſtudy would give me pain to ſee it, were the books which they have written removed. I would not

§ Dr. Fleming.

not part with ſome of their Expoſitions for a trifle; nor exchange a hundred other volumes publiſhed by the Clergy, but on hope of replacing them in better condition.

But if there be any weight in the evidence I have produced from the Honourable Mr. BEAUFOY, Dr. FURNEAUX, Mr. TOWGOOD, and Dr. FLEMING, it is *now* ſeaſonable. For, we are this afternoon to determine whether our temporal advantages are to be preferred to our religious reputation. As all men are neceſſarily Diſſenters, in matters of faith, from thoſe of oppoſite belief, a deliberate diſſent involves in it the *beſt*, or the *worſt*, of every man's character. Satisfied, that my ſeparation from the Church, is well founded, I dare not trifle with that concluſion. They who diſſent on motives in which conſcience is but little concerned, on ſlight temptations, may become *occaſional*, or *complete* CONFORMISTS: but men who fear God, prefer the teſtimony of a good conſcience to every other thought.

If

If, with a ſingle eye, our hearts are ſet on that object, we ſhall decline a conteſt in which we have no *call* to engage, and warn our brethren, who ſeem reſolved to purſue their alarming reſolutions, of the danger of being rouſed into ſtrife by inordinate affection.

" It is very obſervable," (ſays Dr. FURNEAUX) " that a ſpirit of domination and contention aroſe in the Chriſtian Church in proportion to the increaſe of the emoluments and power of its eccleſiaſtics;" (which, by the way, is always connected with the ſecular importance of her profeſſed friends) " and that till Chriſtianity was incorporated with the ſtate, or civil conſtitution, in the time of CONSTANTINE, there were no examples of the debates and diviſions among Chriſtians iſſuing in actual perſecution of each other, on account of difference in religious ſentiment; but no ſooner were worldly emoluments connected with the profeſſion of it, and either beſtowed by the court, or obtained by the ſuffrages of the people, than the great ſtruggle was who

who ſhould poſſeſs them excluſively; and the ſeveral parties, as the moſt effectual means of annihilating each others pretenſions, fell to hereticating, anathematizing, and perſecuting one another." The heart of man, in all ages, is ambitious; and, I believe, an inſatible thirſt for dominion is not to be ſubdued by an arm of fleſh.

Nothing venal, Sir, has led me to this addreſs. The public peace, and the propagation of thoſe ſentiments which are cloſely connected with *revealed* religion, have been conſtantly kept in view. If I have erred, I am open to conviction. "Teach me and I will hold my tongue." At the ſound of inſtruction I ſhall rejoice; but, till I am better informed, I cannot abandon the ‖ propoſitions I have endeavoured to prove.

‖ See page 4, at the bottom.

FINIS.